Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 17

Javed Ahmad Ghamidi and Khalid Zaheer vs. Ali Sina

Part XI

The following is another chapter of the book written by Dr. Ghamidi, where he explains the concept of jihad. As you read this piece, I would like you to keep in mind that Dr. Ghamidi is a moderate Muslim. This article will show you how moderate Muslims think and you will learn about their stance on jihad and how they think the non-Muslims should be treated.

[Ghamidi, Javed A. (2005); "The Islamic Shari'ah of Jihad" translated by Shehzad Saleem; pp. 3-5; Lahore : Al-Mawrid, Institute of Islamic Sciences]

For the second objective, the words used in Surah Baqarah and Surah Anfal (the second and the eighth chapters of the Qur'an) are "Allah's religion reigns supreme" and "all of Allah's religion reigns supreme" respectively. Prior to them, the word "fight them" directs the Muslims to wage war. The antecedent of the pronoun "them" in this statement is the Idolaters of Arabia . Consequently, these expressions mean that in the land of Arabia the religion of Islam would reign supreme. This purpose could only have been achieved in two ways: either the followers of all other religions were to be put to death or they were to be subdued and subjugated completely. Consequently, after many phases interspersed with periods of both war and peace when the disbelievers were totally humiliated, both these ways were adopted. Muslims were directed to kill the Idolaters of Arabia if they did not accept faith and to let the Jews and Christians live on their own religions if they accepted to pay jizyah (the non-Muslim tax) and live a life of total subjugation to the Islamic state established in Arabia .However, the active adversaries among them were put to death or exiled whenever it became possible.

It has been written at the very beginning of this article that the various measures adopted by the Prophet (sws) and his Companions (rta) including warfare were all Divinely ordained. These measures do not belong to the common shar'iah law of Islam. Rather they belong to a specific law that can be termed as the law of *itmam al-hujjah* (unveiling of truth in an undeniable form). This law can be summarized thus: When the truth of a rasul's (messenger's) message is unveiled to a people in its ultimate form such that no one has any excuse to deny it, the rejecters of this truth are punished in this very world.

This seems to be a gross miscalculation on the part of Allah, who appoints fallible people to judge the faith of others and if in their opinion it does not measure up, kill them. Consequently Muslims, following this directive, engage in acts of terrorism and wage war against others and each other. It is natural that each person thinks he has found the truth. These directives of Allah entitle them to declare war on those who do not think like them and kill them, with clarity of conscience thinking that they are doing God's work. It is irrational to believe that God needs humans to do what should be strictly his work.

The history of this worldly Judgment as mentioned in the Qur'an shows that the nature of the punishment meted out is generally of two forms:In one form, a rasul (messenger) has very few companions, and, also does not have a place to migrate. In the second one, he migrates with a considerable number of companions. In fact, even before he even does so, the Almighty arranges for them a territory where they can migrate and live there as its sovereigns with freedom. In both these cases, the established practice of the Almighty regarding His rusul (messenger) manifests itself – the practice which the Qur'an describes in the following words:

"Indeed those who are opposing Allah and His Messenger are bound to be humiliated. The Almighty has ordained: 'I and My Messengers shall always prevail'. Indeed Allah is Mighty and Powerful." (58:20-1)

In the first case, this humiliation takes the form of Divine punishment that descends upon the adversaries of a rasul (messenger) in the form of raging storms, cyclones and other calamities, which completely destroy them. It is evident from the Qur'an that the nations of Noah (sws), Lot (sws), Salih (sws) and Shu'ayb (sws) along with some other nations of rusul (messenger) met with this dreadful fate. The only exception to this were the People of the Book (the Israelites) who were not destroyed because, being the People of the Book, they were basically adherents to monotheism. Their humiliation took the form of constant subjugation to the followers of Jesus (sws) till the Day of Judgment.

If we are to believe that these natural calamities are acts of Divine punishment, then we must conclude that God punishes Muslims most because they generally are affected more by these natural calamities. Furthermore, if Allah has such a low self esteem and is offended so much by the disbelief of his creatures that only by killing them he can feel better, why he does not kill only those who disbelieve? Can't he make his detractors fall dead with a stroke, heart attack or by blowing them into pieces? Why should he resort to these total acts of terrorism, killing so many people indiscriminately? Generally in these "acts of Gods" children are the ones who suffer most. If truly God is this insane, he is for sure unworthy of praise. These natural calamities have nothing to do with God. They are acts of nature. It just happens that we are in the way and get caught. The claim that these are acts of God is yet another blatant fallacy. Only this illogical claim is enough to discredit Islam or any religion that makes such ridiculous claim.

In the second case, a rasul (messenger) and his companions subdue their nation by force, and execute them if they do not accept faith. In this case, his addressees are given some more respite. In this period, the rasul (messenger) does itmam al-hujjah (unveiling of truth in an undeniable form) on the inhabitants of the land to which he had migrated. He morally purifies and reforms his followers and prepares them for a final onslaught with evil. He also consolidates his political power in the land so that he is able to root out the disbelievers and establish the supremacy of the believers through this political power.

Is reducing people into assassins and murderers moral purification? What kind of morality are we talking about? Muhammad was given asylum in Medina and his payback was to divide the population and then subdue, banish and massacre its original inhabitants. Is this moral? No wonder this is what Muslims intend to do in Europe . The point is that Muslims have a totally different understanding of the term evil. In the Muslims' eyes, assassination, raiding, looting, raping and even genocide are not evil and immoral acts when the victims are non-Muslims. However, freedom of thought is an evil thing that has to be eradicated.

> It was this situation which had arisen in the case of the rasul (messenger) Muhammad (sws). After itmam al-hujjah (unveiling of truth in an undeniable form), it was the Jews who were subdued first. They had been granted amnesty because of various pacts. Those among them who violated these pacts were given the punishment of denying a rasul (messenger) of God. The prophet (sws) exiled the tribe of Banu Qaynuqa' to Khayber and that of Banu Nadir to Syria. The power they wielded at Khaybar was crushed by an attack at their strongholds. Prior to this, Abu Rafi' and Ka'b Ibn Ashraf were put to death in their houses. The tribe of Banu Qurayzah was guilty of treachery and disloyalty in the battle of Ahzab. When the clouds of war dispersed and the chances of an external attack no longer remained, the Prophet (sws) laid siege around them. When no hope remained, they asked the Prophet (sws) to appoint Sa'd Ibn Mu'adh (rta) as an arbitrator to decide their fate. Their request was accepted. Since, at that time, no specific punishment had been revealed in the Qur'an about the fate of the Jews, Sa'd announced his verdict in accordance with the Torah. As per the Torah, the punishment for treason was that all men should be put to death; the women and children should be enslaved and the wealth of the whole nation should be distributed among the conquerors. In accordance with this pronounced verdict, all men were executed.

And you don't see anything wrong in this picture? Muhammad treacherously assassinates his critics, among them a centenarian man called Abu Afak and a nursing mother of five named Asma. He banished entire tribes, looting their property and butchering hundreds of men falsely accusing them of conspiring against him with his enemies, the Ahzabs. If that accusation was true, then why the Ahzab left and did not attack Medina? Lies and deceptions were the traits of Muhammad. He made this false accusation to justify his evil acts, kill those who had hurt his gigantic ego by rejecting him and take possession of their wealth. Who was Sa'd to pass such judgment on so many innocent people? Wasn't Muhammad in touch with Allah? Why this Allah who was so fast to reveal verses to justify Muhammad's lustfulness and often acted as his pimp, when it came to such an important decision that involved the lives of an entire population, left it all to a ruffian thug, a wounded and dying man in pain, a bodyguard of Muhammad to pass judgment? Was that judgment fair? Even if the psychopath Muhammad rejoiced and said Sa'd had judged with Allah's wisdom, why Allah did not stop this insane butchery? Assuming the lies of Muhammad about the Banu Quraiza were true, did all the men in this tribe deserve death? Did that warrant such punishment? Muhammad ordered the inspection of the genitals of boys to determine if they had grown pubic hair and if so he counted them amongst men and beheaded them. Is

this justice? What about the fate of the women and children who became slaves? What was their fault?

Here is where Dr. Ghamidi that you can prove that you are a human. It is here that you have to denounce Muhammad and say in a clear voice that what he did was evil. By justifying this monstrous crime you become less human. What defines us as humans is our humanity. If you have already lost it, what else is left in you?

The Pakistani soldiers and the Pakistani president committed despicable acts of barbarity in 1971 in Bangladesh, massacring 3,000,000 unarmed civilians and rapping 250,000 women (God knows how many more did not report out of shame or were part of those killed after being raped). This is a real crime, not like the bogus accusations made by Muhammad against the Banu Quraiza. What do you think should be done to the entire Pakistani nation? Should every Pakistani man be put to death and all their women and children taken as slaves? This is what Muhammad did to the Banu Quraiza. It is unconscionable to defend those acts. Everything Muhammad did was shameful and despicable but this takes the crown. Any person who can't see the evilness of this massacre is evil himself

No other incident worthy of note took place regarding the Jews until in Surah Tawbah (ninth chapter of Qur'an) the final judgment was declared against them:

"Fight those who believe not in Allah or the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which has been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the Religion of Truth, from among the People of the Book, until they pay the jizyah (the non-Muslim tax) with willing submission and are subdued." (9:29)

This directive related to both the Jews and the Christians. The punishment mentioned in these verses was in fact a show of great lenience to them because of the fact that they were originally adherents to monotheism. In reality, they had become worthy of death and destruction after deliberately denying Muhammad (sws). However, they did not benefit from this lenience because after the death of the Prophet (sws) they once again resorted to fraud and treachery. Consequently, the Jews of Khaybar and the Christians of Najran were exile once and for all from the Arabian peninsula by the Caliph 'Umar (rta). This exile in fact thus fulfilled the following declaration of the Qur'an about them:

"And had it not been that Allah had decreed exile for them, He would certainly have punished them in this world; and in the Hereafter theirs shall be the torment of the Fire." (59:3)

When the Idolaters of Arabia had been similarly subdued, it was proclaimed in Surah Tawbah (the ninth chapter of the Qur'an) that in future no pact would be made with them. They would be given a final respite of four months and then they would be humiliated in retribution of their deeds and would in no way be able to escape from this punishment (Qur'an; 9:1-2). Consequently, Makkah was conquered and just as some of the active adversaries among them had been executed when they were caught as prisoners in the battle of Badr and Uhud, similarly at this occasion also such adversaries were put to death.

Here Muhammad put to death people who had ridiculed him. You can't escape the wrath of a narcissist after humiliating him. To a narcissist this is the gravest crime. He is mostly concerned about his ego. Among the victims of Muhammad were a street performer poet Ibn Khatal and his two dancing girls, who had mocked him when he was in Mecca. He did not forget that. A narcissist never forgets and never forgives. The god of Muhammad resembles him. Allah too is a vengeful psychopath narcissist because he is Muhammad's own alter ego.

> Prior to this, the directive had been revealed about them that it should be proclaimed at the time of the great pilgrimage, hajj-i-akbar, (9th Hijra: the ninth year after the prophet's migration to Madinah) that once the forbidden months would be over, Muslims should slay the Idolaters wherever they find them except if they accept faith, establish the prayer and pay zakah (the religious tax). However, those among them who were bound in time-barred pacts with Muslims were an exception to this directive. Muslims were asked to honour these contracts until their stipulated time period was over if their adversaries abided by them. The implication was clear: once the time period expired, these adversaries would also meet the fate that had been ordained for all the Idolaters of Arabia. They were to be killed in case they did not accept faith. This declaration was made in the Qur'an in the following words:

I think the implication for us also must be clear. Muslims will make treaties as long as they are weak, once they become strong, they do not need anymore to make any treaties and will fall on the weaker nations forcing them to convert or be killed. Dr. Ghamidi is spelling the evilness of Islam in a very clear language. We would not pay heed to what he says at our own peril.

> "And a declaration should be made from Allah and His Messenger to these people on the day of the great hajj (pilgrimage) that Allah is free from [all] obligations to these Idolaters and so is His Messenger. So if you [O Idolaters!] repent, it is better for you, but if you turn away, then know that you cannot escape from the grasp of Allah. And give tidings [O Muhammad (sws)!] of a painful torment to these disbelievers. Except those of these Idolaters with whom you have a treaty, and who have not shown treachery in it nor have supported anyone against you. So fulfill their treaty to the end of their term. Indeed, Allah loves those who abide by the limits. Then when the sacred months [after the hajj] have passed, kill these Idolaters wherever you find them, and capture them and besiege them, and lie in wait for them in each and every ambush. But if they repent and establish the prayer, and give zakah (the religious tax), then leave them alone. Indeed, Allah is Ever Forgiving, Most Merciful." (9:3-5)

Thank you Dr. Ghamidi for your candidness and for not trying to dissimulate the truth. You stated the facts better that me. These confessions coming from you carry far more weight than when they are said by me in the form of accusations. You are a Muslim of the moderate variety and yet you see no wrong in all these evil deeds and acts of intolerance and

inhumanity perpetrated by Muhammad. You are not trying in anyways to pretend to be apologetic but are telling things as they are.

The implication for us kafirs should also be clear. Muslims are not going to deal with us any better than their prophet dealt with the non-believers of his time, should we let them get the upper hand. If now they show restraint and are not engaged in wholesale massacre of non-Muslims, it is because they are weak. As Dr. Ghamidi explained, Muhammad did not kill anyone when he was living in Mecca, was weak and knew that he could be punished for his crime. Once he was safe amongst his followers and untouchable, he committed all sorts of crimes, assassinations and murders. Today Muslims are weak. They do as their prophet did. They wait until they gain the strength. Then they will not stop until they subdue each and every person on this planet, kill them or reduce them into dhimmitude.

> With these measures, the basic objective of war stated by the words “all of Allah’s religion reigns supreme” was achieved in the ultimate sense. However, it is explained above that as per the law of itmam al-hujjah (unveiling of truth in an undeniable form), all these measures were an obvious outcome of the fact that first the shahadah (bearing witness to the truth) was established through the Prophet (sws) on the Idolaters and the People of the Book of Arabia and second because of this worldly retribution that took place in Arabia, this shahadah was established on certain nations outside Arabia. Consequently, it was as a result of this that after the truce of Hudaybiyyah, the Prophet (sws) himself, singled out these nations by writing letters to them. The territories of these nations were almost the same as those which in the Torah are called the inherited land of the progeny of Abraham. In all, they were written to the heads of eight countries. Consequently, after consolidating their rule in the Arabian peninsula, the Companions (rta), in order to implement this judgment of the Almighty, launched attacks against these countries giving them two options if they wanted to remain alive: to accept faith or to accept a life of subjugation by paying jizya (the non-Muslim tax). None of these nations was an adherent to polytheism in the real sense, otherwise they would have been treated in the same way as the Idolaters of Arabia.
>
> It is evident from these details that all these armed campaigns and offensives were not merely qital (war), they were in reality a punishment of the Almighty. This punishment, which is meted out to those who deliberately deny the truth of a rasul’s (messenger’s) message, is an established practice of Allah. As a Divine scheme, it descended first upon the Idolaters and the People of the Book of Arabia and then to certain other nations outside it. Consequently, it is absolutely certain that fighting those who have deliberately rejected the truth and forcing the vanquished to lead a life of subjugation by imposing jizyah (the non-Muslim tax) on them is no longer allowed. For Muslims, the sole ground of war now is injustice and oppression. They cannot wage war on any other ground any more. (ibid, pp. 27-33)

Hold on Dr. Ghamidi. The fact that what Muhammad did was utterly evil is beyond proof. You justify all his crimes because in your opinion he was following the orders of the Almighty. This is however what you have yet to prove and we are waiting for that “undeniable proof”. Please tell us how did you conclude that those directives have ended and the further attacks

of Muslims on non-Muslim nations are unwarranted? Is this a personal opinion or is it something you can back up with the Quran? All other Muslims who engage in Jihad today seem to have missed this verse. Will you please show us where does it say, after the conquest of these eight nations, jihad must end? I can show you that Muhammad broke even his own (allegedly Allah's) words in the Qur'an. In no less than two places he said he came for the Meccans and for its surroundings. (*6.92__,* 42.7) Also in verses 32.3 and 36:6 he said that he was ordered to admonish people whom no warner has come to them. This excludes the people of the Book. Muhammad lied and made rules as situation dictated.

> The fact of the matter is that the prophet, may God be pleased with him, as a true follower of Qur'anc teachings, was extremely careful on the question of taking the life of fellow humans. He never allowed anyone to kill another human being without a legitimate reason.

Legitimate reason? Do you really think the massacre of an entire population is legitimate under any circumstance? Is it legitimate to raid and massacre those who want to worship a god different to yours or not worship at all? Do I and those who think like me have the same right to massacre the Muslims because we are convinced that Muslims are blasphemers and idolaters and that Allah is Satan?

> During the first thirteen years of his stay in Makkah as a prophet, he and his companions were criticized, condemned, and even persecuted by the leaders of the tribe of Quraish for accepting a faith different from theirs. However, he always advised his companions to remain patient on the face of adversities. On migrating to Madinah, battles were imposed on him by the enemies which when they were fought they were fought gallantly. During these battles, clear instructions were given that no non-combatant person should be touched nor the assets not relevant to the battle be destroyed.

The above short paragraph contains no less than **five fallacies.**

1- The first fallacy is that when Muhammad was in Mecca, he had no more than 70 or 80 followers, most of whom where renegade youths or dispossessed slaves and therefore he had no choice but to refrain from any violence. Only when he came to Medina and could get away with his crimes he showed his real face. Even the most hardened criminals, act with self restraint when they know they can't get away with their crimes. Only if they can behave when they are free, can we say that they are reformed. Son of Sam is an American psychopath who had killed many people just for the fun of it and for having the public attention. Now that he is caught and has no possibility of killing he has become a born again Christian feigning piety and preaching "hope". This monster would again start killing if he can get away. The fact that Muhammad did not kill anyone when he could not do it is not proof that he was a good man. Even Hitler did not kill anyone while he could not do it.

2- The second fallacy is the claim of persecution. The Qurish did not persecute the Muslims for their faiths. They were polytheists and as such they could not care less what others worshiped. Polytheists are tolerant of differing beliefs by their very nature. It's only the monotheists who think they are the sole possessors of the absolute truth and often are intolerant of other faiths. In Arabia, prior to Islam, there were a multitude of faiths, all living side by side in harmony. Although Arabs fought with one another for the same reasons that other people fought in those days, religious animosity and persecutions were unheard of. Ka'ba alone housed 360 deities, each a patron of a different tribe. There were also many Christians, Jews, Sabeans, and even Zoroastrians who practiced their faiths freely. Khadijah was a Hanifi and her cousin was a Christian monk. So accusing the Quraish of persecuting the Muslims for their faith is preposterous. (I have refuted this claim elsewhere in more detail.) Muhammad taunted the Meccans for 13 years and they did not harm him. There is no proof whatsoever that they intended to kill him when he claimed to have received intimation from Allah that this is what they were planning to do. In verse 8:30 Allah guesses that they were about to "keep you in bounds, or slay you or get you out (of you home). The All knowing Allah is unaware of what the Quraish were about to do. It is clear that this verse was concocted by Muhammad himself. As a narcissist he was paranoid. Paranoid people have persecution complex. This was true in the case of Hitler, Stalin, Saddam, Jim Jones, David Koresh, Charles Manson and virtually all other psychopath narcissists. The origin of this bogus claim should be sought in Muhammad's psychopathology and not in the actions of the Meccans.

3- The third fallacy is your claim that war was imposed on Muslims by the Quraish. It is amazing that you should say that when just a few paragraph earlier you stated "Consequently, after consolidating their rule in the Arabian peninsula, the Companions (rta), in order to implement this judgment of the Almighty, launched attacks against these countries giving them two options if they wanted to remain alive: to accept faith or to accept a life of subjugation by paying jizya (the non-Muslim tax)."

None of the victims of Islam including the Quraish initiated the hostilities. All hostilities began by Muhammad and his marauding gang. It was Muhammad who kept raiding the Meccan caravans and making life impossible for them forcing them to come to the defense of their caravan at Badr and then try to attack Medina during the war of Khandaq to put an end to the nightmare that Muhammad had caused them. The first blood shed in Islam was the blood of a Meccan caravanier that Muhammad's men killed cowardly and with no warning in Nakhlah in the sacred months while treacherously posing as pilgrims. Qazwa means raid not defensive war. Muhammad launched 78 qazwas in the last ten years of his life.

You are not twisting the truth. You are simply repeating a lie, that all Muslims so uncritically rehash and none pauses of one minute to see the contradiction. This is a lie concocted by Muhammad, who on one hand was the victimizer and on the other hand claimed to be the victim. Not a single person among his billion followers wonders how can one reconcile the claim of persecution with the qazwas and the Quranic verses that call for murder of the unbelievers. No wonder Muslims on one hand praise Osama Bin Laden and the terrorists

and on the other hand they deny that Islam has anything to do with those terrorisms and accuse CIA and the Zionists, instead. I am not blaming you Dr. Ghamidi, because I too was caught in this web of lies. I simply did not think about the contradiction. It was much easier not to think and just believe uncritically. You are a smart man. Once you manage to break the shackle of Islam, and see it from outside, you will be able to see countless contradictions and absurdities, far better than me. That is because you are an expert on Islam while I am only a layman.

4- The forth fallacy is your claim that “clear instructions were given that no non-combatant person should be touched nor the assets not relevant to the battle be destroyed.” Since with few exceptions, virtually all the wars of Muhammad were cowardly raids with no warning, those who were killed were unarmed and even if they were physically able to defend themselves, had they had the chance to prepare themselves, caught off guards and unarmed they did not qualify as combatants. Muhammad’s raids were by all accounts cowardly terrorisms launched on unwary citizens and not acts of war. He himself bragged that he owed his victories to terror.

5- The fifth fallacy is about not destroying the assets of his victims. The hadith and Sura clearly mention even to the head count the amount of cattle and herd that Muhammad looted in each raid. Also it is recorded that he cut and burned the palm trees of the Banu Nadir and Taif when he laid siege on them. In the Qur'an he made his alias Allah to approve that crime.

> As we have seen above, apart from fighting the battles imposed upon them, the prophet and the Muslims had another law to follow: Muhammad, God’s mercy be on him, was a messenger (rasul) of God. The law of the Almighty concerning his chosen messengers has always been that He never allowed their immediate addressees the privilege of living beyond a certain limit of time in case they went on rejecting their messages. It was on the basis of this law that the people who received the message from Noah and refused to accept it were ultimately drowned. Likewise, thousands of people were killed during the time of Moses for committing polytheism while he was around. Similarly, in the case of the last prophet, after the true message from God was made manifest to his immediate addressees they were, according to the same divine law, condemned to be killed on the expiry of a specified deadline.

The stories of Pentateuch and Joshua are fables. The Deuteronomy that is allegedly one of the books of Moses, contains his obituary stating that Moses was a great man whose tomb is lost and no one knows where he is buried and that since him no other prophet as great as him has risen among the Israelites. Now how can one write something like this about himself? The Old Testament is a book written by a few rabbis around 700 BC, when the Jews were in captivity. It is hot air and bravado of a vanquished people who were oppressed and made up these stories about how they were once powerful chastising others. None of that is true. Please read the book Who Wrote the Bible? by Richard E.

Friedman. Muhammad's crime are real. They actually happened. And you want to justify real crimes with fairytales? Assuming the stories of the Bible about the genocides of Moses are true, you can't justify one wrong with another. We must denounce both of them.

> Viewed from this context provided by the Qur'an, which, I insist, is the only valid context for any serious student of Islam, what was done by the prophet and his companions was not a criminal act of killing, it was the Godly act of
> removing people from the scene according to His rules. Do you want to blame God for killing people?

First of all you have not given a single proof to the claim that Muhammad was the prophet of God. So the question is moot! It is like I ask you "Do you deny the money I gave you?" when in fact I gave you no money. Secondly, even if he did these things as instructed by Allah, that is enough to conclude that Allah is evil and he can't be the almighty compassionate creator of the world. It defies his wisdom to create humans knowing that they would become unbelievers to then punish them in such a savage way. Only Satan can be so careless about destroying what God has created.

> To sum it up, since I am convinced through my rational reading that the Qur'an is the word of God and that Muhammad is His messenger, what the Qur'an says is what God wills. If you disagree with what the Qur'an says, limit yourself to sorting that problem out rationally. The prophet only implemented God's will. The reports of how he did his job have reached us through less-than-fully-reliable human sources of history. Those reports too, therefore, should be read through the scrutiny of the Qura'nic message, which is the only fully authentic divine text under the sky.

You are convinced through your rational reading? If so share those rational proofs with us too. We can't wait to see that.

> I hope that given the above-stated explanation, I don't need to go into details to explain why the prophet married several ladies. The answer is that he was, like some of the earlier prophets were, allowed to do so by God. The reason is that the messengers of God needed to have special privileges to have families for them to be able to accomplish the task of effectively establishing the dominance of the message they were sent by God with. In order to enable the prophet to provide comfort to the families and tribes who lost their dear ones on account of the implementation of the law explained above, the prophet was given the privilege of resorting to polygamy.

First you say you don't have to justify anything that Muhammad did and have decided to believe in him no matter what, uncritically. Then you go on to give your justification as to why he married and had sex with so many women. Do you really buy your own reasoning? Did Muhammad have to have sex with a score of young girls to accomplish his task as a messenger of God? Did Jesus fail fulfilling that task by being celibate? Why did Muhammad have to have sex with these women and how by having sex with them he was providing comfort for families? Which families were comforted when Muhammad used to have sex with these young girls? The families of most of these girls who were the shares of Muhammad from the booty were massacred. So explain please about this comfort because you have left me dumbfounded. This logic beats me.

Who said messengers of God need to have privileges? If so what sets them apart from charlatans and conmen like James Jones, Shoko Asahara and David Koresh? Shouldn't a prophet of God act with self restraint and dignity to set a good example? What example did Muhammad set? Isn't he the reason why Muslims are so barbarous, backward and uncivilized? They all try to emulate their prophet and demand special privileges wherever they live.

There is a hadith that says when Muhammad raided the town of Bani Jaun , he entered in a house and Jauniyya, a young girl, accompanied be her wet nurse was brought to him. The Prophet said to her "Give me yourself as a gift." The girl responded "Can a princess give herself to an ordinary man?" Muhammad raised his hand to strike her, when she exclaimed, "I seek refuge with Allâh from you," and he stopped. [Bukhari Volume 7, Book 63, Number 182] Was this also ordered by God?

> Again, someone who doesn't believe in the Qur'an should try to concentrate on the basic question of why he doesn't believe in it. I insist that the process demanded for believing in it is a completely rational process. However, without accepting the book as God's, if somebody criticizes others for leading a life in accordance with it, he is like the person who claims that all people who get married in the church are fornicating because he doesn't believe that the church has the authority to allow people to have a physical relationship with anyone else.

Actually one should not wonder why he does not believe in any book. You should rather ask yourself why do you choose to believe in a certain book. If the belief in the Qur'an is rational, then share that with us in a rational way. So far we have not heard anything rational. When Dr. Zaheer claimed that his reversion to Islam was rational and explained the details, it was clear that it was anything but rational.

I would like to reemphasize that the act of killing humans is not allowed under any circumstances save the ones the Almighty has spelt out. After the messenger of God has completed his mission and left this world, no one else has a right to kill a fellow human except for the two reasons (i.e. killing and creating disorder) mentioned in the beginning of this message. For those reasons too, only a formal state has the right to take action. If Muslims are killing fellow humans today in the name of religion it is, according to their own book, as if they are killing the entire humanity. The solution to the problem is to inform Muslims about the correct understanding of Islam. The solution is not to condemn Islam to extinction. While the former solution is difficult but achievable, the latter is impossible and disastrous.

Muslims kill today for the same reasons you say they should. They think anyone resisting Islam is opposing it and anyone who opposes Islam is creating disorder. Therefore his blood is halal. Muslims correctly understand Islam. Assuming others don't, obviously you believe that you do. The way you described Islam for us is shear evil. Islam is correctly understood and that is why the Muslim world is in shambles and there is so much killing going on. The solution is in the eradication of Islam.

In FFI we are trying to understand Islam correctly. We have an open forum where everyone can post and express his/her point of view freely. Truth can manifest only when opposing ideas collide. For the first time in history, we are analyzing Islam critically without the fear of being killed. For the first time truth and falsehood are placed next to each other for the world to see. Up until now, falsehood in Islamic countries had succeeded because truth had been censored and those who spoke it were put to death. Falsehood needs censorship, truth doesn't. We must know the truth for only truth will set us free.

However, reform is only a chimera. Islam cannot be reformed. Take a look at what you wrote. Are you a reformed Muslim? Is this the kind of reform you are talking about? I am afraid it is not good enough. You are saying anyone who criticizes Islam must be put to death, anyone who is an idolater must be put to death, and the people of Book must become dhimmis and pay religious tax. If your reform includes censorship of thoughts, and killing the apostates that is not reform. When you censor thoughts you are invariably helping lies. Truth does not need the heavy hand of censorship to prevail. It actually needs freedom of thoughts to prevail. It's only lies that needs protection through censorship of opposing thoughts. Muslims don't need reform. It is Islam that has to be reformed and that requires throwing out most of the Qur'an.

You described Islam very well and what you described is evil. This debate is a clear poof that Islam cannot be reformed, however, it can be eradicated. We cannot tell Muslims that Muhammad was a messenger of God but please do not follow him because then you would be acting like a criminal. We can however show them that this man was a charlatan

psychopath and that it is not befitting for rational and decent people to believe in a fiend like him. The eradication of Islam is within our reach and with the truth out, it is inevitable.

Why do you think it would be disastrous to get rid of a lie? The disaster is in believing a lie. Islam is the disease of the mind and the society. Would it be disastrous to get rid of a disease? Please tell us what disaster will take place if everyone realizes that Muhammad was a conman and decides to throw the Qur'an, this book of asininity and violence, into dustbin? This is absurd. It's an unfounded fear. It is only the addiction to Islam that makes you think you depend on Islam. You will be far better without this disease and addiction.

Muslims are triumphalists and constantly beat their chests saying "Islam is the fastest growing religion," Now, the only way Islam is growing is through procreation. If that is something to be proud of then rabbits beat Muslims. However, once it becomes clear that many people are actually leaving Islam, their zealotry will die and those Muslims who are desperate to keep their income, will start talking about reform to keep people from leaving. Killing will have no effect because now, the apostates are in touch with each other and they know they are not alone. They are also smart to know how to stay alive and promote their cause.

So, what would be the result of this massive exodus? The mosques will be empty and under funded, the Mullahs will have to find a decent job to make their living and become productive. The madrassas will be closed and the children will go to real schools to learn real knowledge. The youths will not opt to become jihadis and suicide bombers but rather become scientists and entrepreneurs. Half of the Muslim population, the women, which is today unproductive and is kept in ignorance will be free to enter into the work force and compete with men. The governments, instead of making "Islamic atomic bombs" to wipe Israel off the map or destroy India, will start cooperating with all the countries of the world to improve science and technology and all this money that now is funding the military will be spent for the well-being of the citizens. All these changes will catapult these ex-Muslim countries into acme of power and glory. So, what disaster are you talking about? The only people who would face disaster will be the mullahs and those who make a lucrative living by selling the lies of Islam to the foolhardy masses and are hard at work to keep them in the dark. Everyone else will benefit.

Many of us have left Islam and are far more happier. Now we live free without the constant fear of the bogyman Allah and the hatred and distrust of the kafirs. Now we can love all mankind as our brothers and sisters and truly feel we are humans, part of the human race, without the constant paranoia that someone is trying to destroy us. Now, we see no enemy around us. We are all members of one human family and related to each other. The only enemy left is ignorance that is keeping a big portion of humanity in slavery of mind and that is what we are fighting to eliminate.

Once the truth about Islam spreads, first the non-Muslim world will start to wake up, then it would be the turn of Muslims to see the light and come to their senses. Once the elite starts seeing the light and start leaving Islam, the masses will soon follow. The elite is already

leaving Islam. Soon we will have millions of Wafa Sultans, Nonie Darwishs, Walid Shoebats, Ibn Warraqs, Ayan Hishi Alis and many others who have joined FFI and are openly condemning Islam. These are the lights of mankind and particularly the Muslim world. Upon the heroic efforts of these enlightened souls depend the peace of the world and the unity of mankind. Kudos to all the valiant apostates of Islam, the lions and the lionesses of the field of understanding. I sincerely hope that you will join them too and lead millions out of the darkness of ignorance. Don't be a slave of a psychopath charlatan. Muhammad lied. He can only lead you to hell. Join the army of light, lead it to more victories, hoist the standard of freedom, become a torch of guidance, make history and become part of the history. This is the century that will be recorded in history as the century of freedom from ignorance, the century of unity of mankind. Make sure that your name is written in gold at the very top of this glorious chapter of history along with the names I mentioned above.

> Finally, I would like to comment on your following statement: “Belief means accepting a postulate without evidence. Once you have evidence, then it is no longer a belief but a fact.” If that is the definition of belief, then Islamic beliefs don’t fall into that category. They fall into the category of facts which cannot be seen but the evidence of their existence is so clear that those who deny them may fall into one of the following two categories: They are either not prepared to accept the reality expressed before them or they have not been properly informed about them. Can a believer in a book which makes the following statements be a blind follower in any matter of his life: “Tell them: ‘Bring forth a book straighter than these two (i.e. Qur’an and Torah), I will be the first to follow it, if you are really truthful in your claim’” (Qur’an; 28:49). “Indeed the worst beasts in the eyes of God are those men who are deaf, dumb, and blind in that they don’t use their intellect.” (Qur’an; 8:22) “Believers, stand firm on the principles of justice, bearing witness to it for God. And let not the enmity of a nation incline you not to be fair. Be fair, that is closest to the God-fearing attitude. Indeed God is aware of all that you do.” (Qur’an; 5:8).
>
> Khalid Zaheer

If Islam is fact, as you claim, now is your turn to show us that fact. You may as well forget whatever I wrote, if you please and just give us one fact that shows without any doubt that Islam is a message from God. We are waiting.

Kind regards

Ali Sina